

## REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1-14, 51-60, and 63-71. Claims 1, 2, 4, 51, 55, and 57-60 are amended herein. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)*

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 51-53, 56, 61, 63, 64, 66, and 68 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,760,504 to Schaller et al. (hereinafter “Schaller I”).

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserted that Schaller I disclosed a switching element 140 that was analogous to Applicant’s switch interface ring element. Applicant submits that switching element 140 of Schaller I does not rotate radially around a cylindrical portion of a housing such that a magnet fixed in the switch interface ring element activates a magnetic switch element within the housing when rotation of the switch interface ring element radially around said sealed housing brings the magnet in proximity to the magnetic switch element. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 is traversed. As claims 2, 6, 7, 9, and 11 are dependent directly or indirectly from claim 1, the rejection of those claims is also traversed for at least the reason stated above.

The Examiner rejected claims 51-53, 56, 61, 63, 64, 66, and 68 as being anticipated by Schaller I. The Examiner also rejected claims 51, 52, 54, 56-58 and 60 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,152,755 to Trosper et al. (hereinafter “Trosper”). By the amendment above, Applicant has incorporated the features of dependent claim 62 and any intervening claim into claim 51. Claim 62 was previously indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 51 as well as any claims dependent therefrom is believed to be allowable over the cited art.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 as being unpatentable over Schaller I in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,803,604 to Schaller et al. (hereinafter “Schaller II”). The Examiner also rejected claim 5 as being unpatentable over Schaller I. As claims 3-5 are dependent directly or indirectly from

claim 1, the rejection of those claims is traversed for at least the reason stated above with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claim 59 as being unpatentable over Trosper. By the amendment above, Applicant has incorporated the features of dependent claim 62 and any intervening claim into claim 51. Claim 62 was previously indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Thus, claim 59 is believed to be allowable over the cited art.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: February 9, 2007

By:

---

Duane S. Kobayashi  
Reg. No. 41122

Law Office of Duane S. Kobayashi  
1325 Murray Downs Way  
Reston, VA 20194  
Tel: 703-464-7902  
Fax: 703-935-0276